

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 4, 2006, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the amendments and remarks set forth herein. The Assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims distinguish over the cited document.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 15 and 16 are amended. Support for the claim amendments is found in the Specification at paragraphs [0007], [0017] and [0019], for example. The Specification is amended at paragraphs [0001] and [0002] to provide serial numbers of commonly-assigned U.S. Applications incorporated by reference in this pending application. No new matter is submitted. Accordingly, entry and consideration of the application in view hereof is respectfully requested.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (the “Office”) rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,601,066 to Davis-Hall (hereafter “*Davis-Hall*”). As agreed during the Interview and as shown herein, however, the pending claims, as amended, distinguish over the cited *Davis-Hall* document. The Assignee thus respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) rejection.

Telephone Interview

Assignee appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Mark Duncan in conducting the telephone Interview of December 5, 2006, wherein it was agreed that the sole applied reference, U.S. Patent 6,601,066 to Davis-Hall, does not teach or disclose at least the feature of “*a configurable file providing user specified frequency and levels of analysis of starting web pages*”, as is now recited in each of the pending independent claims.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e)

The Office rejects claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as allegedly anticipated by *Davis-Hall*. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element is found in a single prior art reference. *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q. 2d (BNA) 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *See also* DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 2131 (orig. 8th Edition) (hereinafter “M.P.E.P.”).

Claims 1-16 cannot be anticipated by *Davis-Hall*. These claims, as amended, recite or incorporate features that are not disclosed by *Davis-Hall*. Independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 16, for example, are set forth in full above and respectively recite a method (claims 1 and 6), a system (claim 15), or a computer program product (claim 16) that communicates with a server specified by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) from a configurable file providing user specified frequency and levels of analysis of starting web pages, and parses content retrieved from the URL, or from an additional URL linked thereto, in order to determine if the content contains an error message. The content retrieved in claims 1, 6, 15 and 16 is thus retrieved from the URL of one of the starting web pages from the configurable file of starting web pages, or from an additional URL linked thereto. In either case, the URL of one of the starting web pages provided from the configurable file of starting web pages initiates retrieval of the content that is then parsed to determine any errors. Further, the configurable file of starting web pages recited in each of claims 1, 6, 15 and 16 enables the frequency and level of analysis of a selected web page to be dynamically determined by a user. The applied *Davis-Hall* reference requires the compilation of a hyperlink database before any error analysis can occur and does not provide a configurable file providing user specified frequency and levels of analysis of starting web pages as recited in each of pending independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 16. *Davis-Hall* thus fails to disclose a method or system that dynamically retrieves content via a URL from a configurable file of starting web pages.

Examiner Duncan is correct that *Davis-Hall* discloses “A method and system for detecting and reporting hyperlinks that return error codes.” *See, e.g.*, U.S. Patent 6,601,066 to Davis-Hall (July 29, 2003) at column 3, lines 49 through 52. *Davis-Hall*, however, requires the compilation of a hyperlink database of all of the various hyperlinks to be analyzed. *Id.* at column

3, line 63 through column 4, line 17. Once established, the hyperlink database is a static source of all hyperlinks browsed or analyzed for errors in *Davis-Hall*. Even though the compilation of the hyperlink database may be achieved automatically in *Davis-Hall*, the database still must be initially compiled before any further Internet browser program is opened or any further analysis of the hyperlinks identified in the database is undertaken. *See, id.* at column 4, lines 18 through line 25. In this regard, the database dependent method and system of *Davis-Hall* is limited to verifying the integrity of only those statically defined hyperlinks identified in the database. Moreover, *Davis-Hall* scans a website and generates a list of broken or altered hyperlinks for that website. *See, id.* at column 3, lines 53 through 54. *Davis-Hall* thus analyzes an entire website, and does not provide a configurable file that enables a user to determine the level of analysis of a selected web page. *Davis-Hall* thus does not teach or disclose the web-content verifying methods, systems and computer program products recited in pending claims 1, 6, 15 and 16 in which web content is dynamically retrieved from the URL of a configurable file of starting web pages, or URL's linked thereto, and then parsed to determine the existence or non-existence of errors therein. All remaining claims ultimately depend from one of claims 1, 6, 15 and 16.

The patent to *Davis-Hall*, then, cannot anticipate pending claims 1-16, as each recites at least a configurable file providing user specified frequency and levels of analysis of starting web pages, rather than the static, non-configurable database that is required in *Davis-Hall*. The Assignee therefore respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) rejection of claims 1-16.

CONCLUSION

The Assignee submits that the claims presented are patentable in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. Accordingly, a prompt Notice of Allowance of all claims is respectfully solicited.

Of course, should the Examiner determine that anything further is desirable to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@wzpatents.com.

Attorney Docket: BS030820
U.S. Patent App. No.: 10/813,492
U.S.P.T.O Art Unit 2113
Response to October 4, 2006 Office Action

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390